



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/528,524	03/18/2005	D. Koch	1299US2	8292
25279	7590	11/18/2008		
GRACO MINNESOTA INC PO BOX 1441 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440				
EXAMINER				
CARTAGENA, MELVIN A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3754				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/18/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/528,524

**Applicant(s)**

KOCH ET AL.

**Examiner**

MELVIN A. CARTAGENA

**Art Unit**

3754

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 August 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 5,601,413 to Langley et al.

Langley shows a pumping system as seen in Fig. 1, having a pump 11 driven by motor 12, a flow meter 20 incorporated into and as part of the pump and mounted onto the dispensing hose, see Fig. 2, a suction tube 32, a bulk container 34, a dispense valve 24, a dispense hose 22 and a check valve 27 requiring a predetermine non-negligible fluid pressure to open.

3. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 5,743,357 to Few.

Few shows an oil dispenser as seen in Figs. 1, 5 and 6, having a pump 58 driven by a motor, a flow meter 38, a suction tube 154, a bulk container 204, dispenser valve 26 connected to the device and mounted on the same housing 12 as the display panel 21, dispensing hose 74 and a hose storage reel 60 as part of the dispensing assembly.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5,601,413 to Langley et al. in view of US 6,729,364 to Few et al. ('364).

Langley shows all claimed features as discussed above except for the use of wireless communication between the dispensing valve and the flow meter. Few shows an integrated manifold assemble as seen in Figs. 1 and 3, having a dispensing valve actuated with a remote pendant 230. It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Langley to include a remote communication between the dispensing valve and the flow meter to automatically stop the flow of fluid once the desired volume has been dispensed while using a conventional delivery hose without any hard wiring as taught by Few.

6. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5,601,413 to Langley et al.

Langley shows all claimed features as discussed above but is silent about the type of pump. The type of pump use presents no novel or unexpected result over the pump used in the references. The selection of a pump depends on the properties of the fluid to be pumped, such as the fluid viscosity, fluid density, etc. The selection of the type of pump in lieu of those used in the references solves no stated problem and would be an obvious matter of design choice within

the skill of the art. *In re Launder*, 42 CCPA 886, 222 F.2d 371, 105 USPQ 446 (1955); *Flour City Architectural Metals v. Alpana Aluminum Products, Inc.*, 454 F. 2d 98, 172 USPQ 341 (8th Cir. 1972); *National Connector Corp. v. Malco Manufacturing Co.*, 392 F.2d 766. 157 USPQ 401 (8th Cir.) cert. denied, 393 U.S. 923, 159 USPQ 799 (1968).

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed December 12, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., plug and play system, well suited for mounting on a drum) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In reference to claim 5, any check valve requires a predetermined no-zero amount of pressure to open, there would be no fluid flow at zero pressure.

In response to arguments with respect to claim 6, that there is no communication between the flow meter and the dispensing valve thought the dispensing hose, the flow meter 20 and the dispensing valve 24 are mounted onto the same dispensing hose, see Figs. 1 and 2, both the flow meter and the dispensing valve are in communication by the dispensing hose.

In response to arguments that the there is no wireless communication user in the device of Few ('364), see column 20, lines 48-59.

***Conclusion***

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MELVIN A. CARTAGENA whose telephone number is (571)272-4924. The examiner can normally be reached on T-F (7:30AM to 6:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin P. Shaver can be reached on (571) 272-4720. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/M. A. C./  
Examiner, Art Unit 3754

/Frederick C. Nicolas/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3754